

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>LAMONT ARMSTRONG,</b>	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 16 C 3327
	)	
<b>THOMAS J. DART, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM ORDER**

On October 11, 2016 this Court explained orally to pro se prisoner plaintiff Lamont Armstrong (“Armstrong”), for whom arrangements had been made to participate telephonically in a hearing on “Defendant Sheriff’s Motion for Entry of an Order in Lieu of Answer,” just what he had to do to obtain the assistance of designated counsel -- “something really essential to his ability to proceed with his lawsuit.”<sup>1</sup> In accordance with that explanation and this Court’s issuance of the memorandum order referred to in n. 1, this Court once more sent to Armstrong counterparts of the Clerk’s-Office-supplied form of Motion for Attorney Representation (“Attorney Motion”), explaining what Armstrong had to do to obtain the assistance of counsel. That was this Court’s third effort to assist Armstrong, issued “[i]n the hope that the third time may prove the charm.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> What has just been quoted is drawn from this Court’s memorandum order issued on that same October 11 date.

<sup>2</sup> Once again the text quotation is drawn from the October 11 order.

That hope has gone unfulfilled, for Armstrong has still not complied with the requirements of the Attorney Motion. Indeed, nothing at all has been heard from Armstrong since then (the court docket's last entry in the case related to the October 11 memorandum order). Accordingly, this case is really a poster child for dismissal for want of prosecution, and this Court so orders.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Milton I. Shadur". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'M'.

---

Milton I. Shadur  
Senior United States District Judge

Date: November 22, 2016